

**1. Responses to Office Action**



Response to #3:

It is the advertiser computer receives the third information, which is part of the fourth information if not all. The fourth information is then transmitted to ad viewer computer. Please let me know whether this explanation makes the claims 1 and 13 clear.

Response to #5:

Claims 13 and 19-24 are amended.

RSS is defined at paragraphs [0056] and [0057] in the specification of the original application.

Response to #7:

Krishna discloses an online editing tool, by which one can generate a webpage. Leeke discloses an online broadcasting system, which might contain an advertising module. In Krishna, the owner of the publication is also the editor of the publication. Although, the publication might contain ads, the advertiser cannot directly manage (or control, update) the ads. Similarly in Leeke, the displayed ads are managed (or controlled, updated) by the owner of the broadcasting system, not directly by the advertisers.

The application here discloses an online publication, which contains multiple ads and each ad is delimited within one advertising box. The owner of the publication does not manage (or control, update) the ads. Instead, each ad is managed (or controlled, updated) by its own advertiser. As a result, multiple advertisers are competing directly against each other on one publication. Each advertiser manages (or controls, updates) his own ads. The

invention eliminates the maintenance effort by the owner of the publication. Therefore, considering this fundamental difference, the invention disclosed here is nonobvious to Krishna and Leeke combined.

**2. Claims 33-38 are added for review.**

The newly added claims are fully supported by the specification of the original application.